

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 22 through 47 are pending, with Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 being independent. Claims 22, 25, 28 through 31, 34, 37 through 39, 42, and 45 have been amended. Claims 46 and 47 have been added.

Claims 22 through 45 yet again were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,522,352 B1 (Strandwitz, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,350 (Davis). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 22, 25, and 28 variously recite, *inter alia*, receiving from the first apparatus through the wireless network, decoding, encoding, and transmitting to the second apparatus through the wired network, and Claims 31, 34, and 37 variously recite, *inter alia*, receiving from the second apparatus through the wired network, decoding, encoding, and communicating with/transmitting to the first apparatus through the wireless network, with all of Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 reciting, *inter alia*, that the first video encoding system is suitable for a first communication protocol used between the first apparatus and the communication apparatus, and the second video encoding system is suitable for a second communication protocol used between the second apparatus and the communication apparatus.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Strandwitz, et al. nor Davis, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, arguendo, that such could be

combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37.

The Official Action relies upon Strandwitz, et al. for showing gateway 401. Applicants respectfully submit that said gateway “provides protocol translation to convert the wireless protocol to the standard public network protocol or the standard PC interface protocol” (e.g., col. 6, line 60 et seq.), and the Official Action acknowledges that Strandwitz, et al. fails to show the decoding/encoding as claimed. In other words, Applicants stress that Strandwitz, et al. is silent at least as to the use of decoding/encoding using first and second video encoding systems as claimed, wherein the first video encoding system is suitable for a first communication protocol used between the first apparatus and the communication apparatus, and the second video encoding system is suitable for a second communication protocol used between the second apparatus and the communication apparatus — i.e., Strandwitz, et al. is in Applicants’ view a system which requires no conversion of video encoding as claimed.

Accordingly, the Official Action relies upon Davis for showing decoding and encoding. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Davis shows wired/wired transmission and thus fails to show the wireless/wired arrangement as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to attempt to modify Strandwitz, et al. with Davis’s decoding and encoding so as to attempt to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37. By means of the above-discussed claimed features, Applicants respectfully

submit that the present invention allows, for example, encoded video data to be transmitted from a wireless/wired network to a wired/wireless network through a communication apparatus while the communication apparatus is changing over a video encoding system of the encoded video data being transmitted. Of course, the claims are not limited to the foregoing or to the disclosed embodiments.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C., office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Attorney for Applicants
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG/cmg

DC_MAIN 273840v1